REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated December 21, 2004. Claims 1-40 and 84-99 are pending in the patent application. Claims 1-3, 13, 18, 19, 26, 27 and 39 have been amended. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments made herein.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 3 were objected to based on informalities. Claims 1-3, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-18, 19, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-7, 9-22, 24-35, 37-40 and 84-99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Clams 8, 23 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully submit, for at least the reasons set forth below, that the rejections have been overcome or are improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the specification and the patentability of Claims 1-40 and 84-99.

Claims 1-3, 13, 17-19, 26 and 39 were objected to because the Patent Office states the phrase "of a plurality" should be inserted between the terms "one" and "of" in ln. 5 of claim 1. The Patent Office also states that the term "itself" in ln. 3 of claim 3 should be deleted so that the claim reads more clearly. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 accordingly. Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1 and 3 are overcome.

Claims 1-3, 13, 17-19, 26 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the claims recite "an electronic document" several times. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims to refer to "the electronic document." No new matter has been added by any of these amendments.

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action states that the claim element of "categorization means" appears to allow the user to specify particular categories of documents to search and determining the category to which the document belongs at the client terminal. The Office Action states that because documents are only retrieved that correspond to the specified categories, no determination of the category to which the document belongs is necessary at the client computer. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As fully supported in Applicant's specification, for example, the claim element "categorization means" includes the automatic and manual categorization of documents at the terminal device of the document processing system. Categorization is performed either in a manual fashion by a user in accordance with the content of given document data or in an automatic fashion by the document processing apparatus 1. Pg. 62, para. 1. In the initial state, the document processing apparatus 1 has no categorization model. Id. It is therefore required to manually generate a categorization model and perform categorization. Id. If a categorization model has been generated, it becomes possible to automatically categorize given document data. Id.

Each document includes an index, where the index includes a proper noun and/or other words that characterize the document. Pg. 63, para. 3. Therefore, categorization or retrieval can be performed using an index. Id.

As shown in Fig. 5, step F13, a document is inputed to the document processing apparatus 1. The document is then displayed on the screen of the display 30 in response to a command issued by the user so that the user can read it. When the user reads a document in the manual categorization process, step F14 is performed to generate categories and categorize the document. In step F14, the controller 11 generates and displays categories in accordance with an operation performed by the user. The user then specifies a category for each document. In response, the controller 11 categorizes and displays document.

In step F15, the controller 11 generates a categorization model on the basis of categories generated by the user in step F14 and also on the basis of categorization performed by the user for each document. The categorization model includes data that represents correspondence between categories and elements of indexes (generated in step F12) of respective documents. That is, the categorization model represents how documents are categorized.

As detailed in Fig. 5, once an index is generated, a user can read a document and then manually categorize a document. Fig. 5, steps F13-F14. Fig. 10 shows a categorization window 201 used to categorize documents. The categorization window 201 includes subwindows serving as document category display areas 203, 204, 205, etc., corresponding to categories based on the categorization model. Display area 203 is used to display documents that have not yet

been categorized. Pg. 82, para. 4. The other display areas **204** etc., are used to display documents categorized in a specific category. Pg. 83, para. 1. A user can then manually categorize any of the documents displayed in display area **203** into a category. Pg. 86, para. 3. A user can manually categorize a document by using the input unit **20**, such as a mouse to drag a document from the display area **203** that contains the uncategorized documents to a document category display area corresponding to the desired category. Pg. 87, para. 4.

In categorization window **201** a user can add, delete or update a category as required. Pg. 86, para. 4. Changes to the categories are reflected in the categorization window **201**. Pg. 87, para. 2. The categorization window displays documents is the display areas **203, 204, 205**, etc., based upon the category to which the document is categorized in.

As previously discussed, a document may also be automatically categorized by the document processing apparatus **1**. Documents may be categorized as they are received, after a predetermined number are received, or when the window is open. Fig. 9, pg. 92, para. 3. The receiver **21** receives one or more documents. Fig. 13, pg. 93, para. 1 The controller **11** then generates an index for each document received. Id. The controller **11** can then, using the document index, categorize the documents into one of the categories of the categorization model. The controller **11** then updates the categorization model on the basis of the result of the automatic categorization performed on the document. The automatic categorization process is similar in manner to the manual categorization process. Pg. 94, para. 2.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 112 rejections be withdrawn. Applicant notes for the record that the amendments to the claims as discussed above are intended for clarification purposes, and further, Applicant does not intend to disclaim and/or narrow any subject matter in view of same.

Claims 1-7, 9-22, 24-35, 37-40 and 84-99 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferguson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092 ("*Ferguson*"). Applicant believes that this rejection is improper for at least the reasons set forth below.

For the purposes of the examination of the present patent application, the Patent Office assumed that the "categorizing functions" relate to a user specifying categories to be searched.

Office Action pg 5-6. However, as discussed above, "categorizing means" as fully supported by the specification, relates to the automatic or manual categorization of documents into categories. Categorization allows documents to be displayed by category. The categorization window **201** includes subwindows serving as document category display areas **203, 204 205**, etc., corresponding to categories based on the categorization model. Pg. 82, para. 4.

In contrast, as cited by the Patent Office, *Ferguson* discloses that online services provide for searchable directories that can be searched by name, category or utilizing a full-text search. Col. 14, ln. 6-12. The directories can be arranged in categories, much like a conventional telephone book. Id. *Ferguson* also includes a document harvester. The harvester is a tool that allows one to select which files, directories and volumes are to be indexed for full-text search and retrieval. Col. 18, ln. 13-22. Accordingly, *Ferguson* does not disclose a document processing system that includes in part, a terminal device including, in part, a categorizing means for categorizing an electronic document into one of a number of categories according to a characteristic of said electronic document and a specification information input means for specifying the electronic document categorized in one of said categories or specifying one of said categories as required by the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference not only fails to disclose the claimed invention, it fails to teach or suggest the same. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 23 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ferguson*. Applicant specifically disagrees and traverses.

Claims 8, 23 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Ferguson*. Applicant respectfully submits that the patentability of claims 1, 18 and 31, renders moot the obviousness rejections of Claims 8, 23 and 36. In this regard, the cited art at a minimum fails to teach or the subject matter of Claims 8, 23 and 36 in combination with the subject matter of claims 1, 18 and 31 at least for substantially the same reasons as discussed above, where Claims 8, 23 and 36 depend from Claims 1, 18 and 31. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY _____

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4310

Dated: February 16, 2005